

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19-21 and 25-33 were previously pending in the instant application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16 and 19 have been allowed and Claims 25, 26, 28, 29 and 31-33 have been rejected. By way of the above amendments, Claims 1, 20, 25-28 and 31-33 have been amended and Claim 25 has been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19-20 and 25-33 are now pending in this application.

Objection to Claims:

Within the Office Action Claims 1, 12, 26 and 33 have been objected to for a number of informalities. By way of the above amendment Claims 1, 12, 26 and 33 have been amended to correct the informalities outlined in the Office Action. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to recite that bristles “flank opposed sides of the curved elongated edge formed by the curved elongated walls,” thus making clear the relationship between the edge, walls and bristles.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Within the Office Action Claim 25 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0154112 to Braun (hereafter, “Braun”).

Claim 25 has been amended to recite separate support surfaces each with bristles and each with a squeegee, wherein at least one of the first support surface and the second support surface is configured to automatically move independently and separately of the other of the first support surface and the second support surface, while the cleaning head is coupled to a motorized handle. Braun fail to teach or suggest these features. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 25 is allowable over the teaching of Braun.

The independent Claim 33 has been amended to recite an electric toothbrush with a cleaning head, the cleaning head comprising a first region with a first support surface having a continuous and substantially circular squeegee element that encircles bristles protruding from the first support surface and wherein the first support surface is configured to rotate or oscillate and a second region with a second support surface configured to automatically move independently from the first support surface in a least one direction that is different from the first support surface, the second support surface having at least one of a squeegee, bristle tufts and nodules protruding therefrom. Braun fails to teach or suggest a support surfaces configured to

automatically move independently from each other and in at least one direction that is different from each other. For at least these reasons the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teaching of Braun.

Within the Office Action Claims 25 and 26 been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0196283 to Eliav (hereafter, "Eliav").

As described above, Claim 25 has been amended to recite separate support surfaces each with bristles and each with a squeegee, wherein at least one of the first support surface and the second support surface is configured to automatically move independently and separately of the other of the first support surface and the second support surface, while the cleaning head is coupled to a motorized handle. Eliav fail to teach or suggest these features. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 25 is allowable over the teaching of Eliav.

Claim 26 has been amended to recite bristles border opposed sides of the second elongated curved wiping edge of the second squeegee element and also positively recite a motorized handle. Eliav fails to teach a first and second support surface is configured to automatically move independently and separately of the other of the first support surface and the second support surface and squeegees with bristles that broader opposed sides of an elongated and curved squeegee. For at least these reasons the independent Claim 26 is allowable over the teaching of Eliav.

Within the Office Action Claim 31 been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 3,195,537 to Blasi (hereafter, "Blasi"). The rejection of Claim 31 as being anticipated by Blasi is considered moot in view of the above amendments.

Specifically, Claim 31 has been amended to recite a first support surface with a first set of bristle protruding therefrom and a second support surface with a second set of bristle protruding therefrom and a continuous and substantially circular squeegee element that encircles a portion of the second support surface and the second set of bristles, wherein the second support surface is coupled to a drive mechanism for automatically rotating or oscillating the second support surface independently and separately from the first support surface and wherein the first set of bristles surround at least a portion of the continuous and substantially circular squeegee element, and wherein the first support surface is configured to rotate or oscillate. These features are neither taught or suggested by Blasi. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 31 allowable over the teaching of Blasi.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Within the Office Action, Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blasi in view U.S. Patent No. 1,993,763 to Touchstone (hereafter, "Touchstone").

Neither Blasi, Touchstone nor their combination teach a device with independently and separately moving regions. This feature in combination with bristle encircled by and encircling a continuous squeegee element further distinguish the claimed invention over the teachings of Blasi, Touchstone and their combination.

Within the Office Action, Claims 28 and 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0152564 to Blaustien (hereafter, "Blaustien") in view Eliav.

Neither Blaustien, Eliav nor their combination teaches support surfaces each with squeegees that encircles regions of the support, and wherein at least one of the support surfaces moves relative to the other. For at least these reason, the independent Claim 28 is allowable over the teachings of Blaustien, Eliav and their combination.

Claim 29 depends from the independent Claim 28. For all the reasons stated above, the independent Claims 28 is allowable over the teaching of Blaustien, Eliav and their combination. Accordingly Claim 29 is also allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19-20 and 25-33 are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 6/22/2006

By: 

James A. Gavney Jr.
Reg. No. 45,687

Agent for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.6(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

-10-

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
Date: 6-22-06 By: 